

he said: "In the interest of economy and the economic health of the nation, I request that the funding of the Federal Courthouse Annex be withheld until such time as the budgetary picture becomes clearer, and the demands on the Federal dollar are reduced."

Mr. Schultze's reaction to this communication seems to have been, understandably, an amazed silence. There is almost no precedent for a legislator asking that funds be withheld from public works—that sacred Congressional institution, the pork barrel—particularly when located in the middle of the legislator's home Congressional district.

Perhaps Mr. Fulton's sacrificial gesture in behalf of restraining Federal expenditures will not help to get him re-elected. But even if it goes down as a footnote to Congressional annals as "Fulton's Fiscal Folly" it certainly ought to make him remembered as the man who put the nation's economic health ahead of a courthouse annex.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MCCARTHY FOR HIS BOOK "THE LIMITS OF POWER"

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, without question, one of the great figures in this Nation and in this body is the senior Senator from Minnesota, Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY. Senator MCCARTHY is a man of many and diverse talents. He is equally at home in the world of ideas and actions. He is an eloquent speaker, a wise and witty man. In addition to this, Senator MCCARTHY is an author of real distinction and has recently authored a book entitled "The Limits of Power: America's Role in the World."

This book has been reviewed very favorably by the New York Times which points out that the book substantially increases our insight into very serious problems this Nation faces in the world. The book is written by a Senator who has served on the Committee on Foreign Relations for many years, a man who has demonstrated before the Nation his grasp of the complex foreign policy that faces the Nation and who has demonstrated his courage in speaking his mind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the book review written by Charles Poore, which was published in the New York Times this morning, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the book review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MAN'S POLICING IS ANOTHER MAN'S LIBERATING

(By Charles Poore)

E. B. White once suggested that perhaps it would take a vicious menace from another planet to unite our divided and pugnacious world.

I remember Mr. White's paragraph trope from The New Yorker when I face each season's clamor of serious books on rugged world affairs. They want peace but they can't quite produce it. And with each author doing his thing, the lot presents fresh divisiveness and printed pugnacity. Chances are that no two—let alone no two dozen—eminent authorities wholly agree on what we must do to be saved.

Yet all books add something to what we should know. The useful ones honor clarity. Great stuff may lie buried in jabberwocky prose, but it's tough to unearth it there. A happy medium lies in "The Limits of Power: America's Role in the World," by Senator Eugene J. McCarthy, a Minnesota Democrat. Agree with him or not, he's clear, quick, and readable.

Adlai E. Stevenson was Mr. McCarthy's ideal. If this book has a personal mark, it's the mark he thinks Mr. Stevenson would have made on America's foreign policy—"had his ideas and attitudes been translated into political reality."

ADVISE MORE, CONSENT LESS

Take the hypothesis and let the credit for it go. Here are some of Mr. McCarthy's elemental conclusions: First, the United States should work zealously through the best international agencies. Second, our great armament exports and the C.I.A. could use more Capitol Hill supervision. Third, the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee—on which Mr. McCarthy serves—might well do more advising and less consenting.

These principles seem generally Stevensonian, with the last a possible exception. At any rate, finding the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as well as the President and the State Department breathing harder down his neck at the United Nations would perhaps occasionally have troubled even Mr. Stevenson's urbane mind.

Now we're off to the all-too-human races. With Mr. McCarthy as our expert guide, we rush from the Middle East to the South Pacific, from South America to India.

The book's flow takes unpredictable courses, too. Not everyone would expect the dissertation on marketing the Dominican Republic's sugar crop, and little about the Soviet missile lunge in Cuba that included Mr. Stevenson's most famous hour of political reality.

Mr. McCarthy is as troubled as any of us by the Vietnamese tragedy. He's against the war, but he's not about to join either the victory-at-any price or the peace-at-any-price logicians.

In Mr. McCarthy's rear-view mirroring, the changing perspectives time gives past problems stand out instructively. Retroactively, he's not against America's entry to the last two world wars. In those days, however, eloquent voices were raised against our mixing into fights they called irrelevantly distant. Perhaps it was Thomas Jefferson who set a pattern for way out yonder ventures when he made the Mediterranean safe for Americans by fighting the Barbary pirates.

"A nation," Mr. McCarthy says, "has prestige according to its merits. America's contribution to world civilization must be more than a continuous performance demonstration that we can police the planet."

The rub, this book suggests, is that one man's policing is another man's blow for liberty. But we don't want E. B. White's parable of another planet policing us, or even liberating us, to come true.

THIEU-KY PROGRESS IN PACIFICATION ESSENTIAL IN VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, regardless of a Senator's position on our Vietnam policy it should be clear that we are not going to achieve our objective of peaceful negotiations unless a far greater effort is put into the so-called other war—social reform, economic development, land reform, educational achievement, improvement of health.

It is in these areas where the greatest progress for constructive resolution of this guerrilla contest must develop.

This morning's New York Times points out that the Thieu-Ky government has made extensive promises in these areas and that Ambassador Bunker is pressing hard for these commitments to be kept.

If we are ever to have any hope of ending this tragic war, the South Vietnamese Government must move ahead in this slow, painful unspectacular area.

Ambassador Bunker deserves credit for insisting on it.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial entitled, "Promises To Keep" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROMISES TO KEEP

The clearest thing about the Thieu-Ky regime in South Vietnam is the long list of commitments it has made to promote pacification, local security, social reform and economic development in that war-ravaged country. The pledges were made to the South Vietnamese people and to all of Saigon's war allies at the top-level conference at Honolulu, Manila and Guam. They were made again in the election campaign.

Now Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker is exercising pressure on the Saigon Government to make certain that these long-promised reforms are actually carried out. It is both appropriate and essential that this be done. The military effort, which is claiming a rising toll in American lives and resources, must fall unless the countryside can be pacified and public confidence established in the honesty and efficiency of the central Government.

These are tasks only Vietnamese can accomplish, and Saigon's performance to date has fallen far short of the generals' pledges. After a hard look at the situation in South Vietnam last summer, a Congressional watchdog committee reported:

"We are deeply concerned about the lack of meaningful progress and reform in the lagging and floundering pacification program; in dealing with the problem of refugees, inflation and land reform; in the conduct of the elections, and in the over-all administration with its entrenched and inefficient bureaucracy."

From the outset of American involvement the Washington-Saigon partnership has been based on mutual commitments. The United States has more than fulfilled its pledges. President-elect Thieu and Vice President-elect Ky have yet to do so.

HOW CONGRESS CAN CUT SPENDING RESPONSIBLY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, when Congress is confronted with the need to reallocate or cut Federal spending, two alternative budget-paring mechanisms can be used. The traditional method is that of the meat ax; Congress cuts some specific amount from every spending request, and successful programs are slashed as much as less-productive projects. For example, poverty and education programs may be trimmed, but the need for these programs certainly does not diminish; short-term spending may be curtailed, yet the disastrous results from meat-ax reductions in these vital areas often means higher Government expenditures over the long run. In short, the meat-ax cure is worse than the illness.

The alternative to the meat ax is for Congress to establish a rational system of spending priorities. Budget requests can be ranked in terms of some payoff guidelines. When expenditures must be lowered, Congress can cut first the lower rated programs.

Tools for such a mechanism already exist. Many of them have been incorporated into the planning-programing-budgeting—PPB—system. Among these